

## Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 05624 01 OF 03 212052Z

73

ACTION EUR-25

INFO OCT-01 EA-11 IO-14 ISO-00 CIAE-00 PM-07 INR-10 L-03

NEA-10 NSAE-00 PA-04 RSC-01 PRS-01 SPC-03 TRSE-00

SAJ-01 ACDA-19 SS-20 NSC-10 OMB-01 OIC-04 AEC-11

SSO-00 NSCE-00 USIE-00 INRE-00 EURE-00 AECE-00 DRC-01

/157 W

----- 054639

O P 211900Z NOV 73

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 2799

SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE

INFO ALL NATO CAPITALS PRIORITY 3465

AMEMBASSY VIENNA PRIORITY

USMISSION EC BRUSSELS PRIORITY

USMISSION GENEVA PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY TOKYO PRIORITY

CONFIDENTIAL SECTION 1 OF 3 USNATO 5624

E.O. 11652: GDS, 12-31-79

TAGS: PFOR, NATO

SUBJ: ATLANTIC RELATIONS: NAC DISCUSSION NOVEMBER 21

VIENNA FOR USDEL MBFR

GENEVA FOR USDEL CSCE

BEGIN SUMMARY: COUNCIL DEBATE NOVEMBER 21 ON ATLANTIC RELATIONS  
PRODUCED ACCEPTANCE OF FRENCH REVISED TEXT AS WORKING DOCUMENT  
FOR PREPARATION OF AN ALLIANCE DECLARATION OF THE FIFTEEN.  
SEVERAL DELGATIONS SUBMITTED AMENDMENTS AND MANY SUGGESTED  
FURTHER STUDY OF KEY PARAGRAPHS 3 THROUGH 6 AS THE "CRUX"  
ELEMENTS IN THE DECLARATION. THERE WAS GENERAL CONSENSUS URGING  
THAT ALL NATIONAL COMMENTS/REVISIONS IN THE FRENCH DRAFT BE  
PRESENTED BY NEXT WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 28--OR BEFORE--SO THAT  
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 NATO 05624 01 OF 03 212052Z

DRAFTING WORK COULD MOVE FORWARD IN TIME TO PERMIT A COMPLETED  
TEXT FOR THE DECEMBER 10-11 MINISTERIAL. ACTIVE INTEREST  
CONTINUES IN THE PRESENTATION OF U.S. TEXTUAL VIEWS. AMBASSADOR  
RUMSFELD EXPRESSED THE HOPE THAT U.S. DEL WOULD BE IN A

POSITION TO COMMENT ON "THIS PHASE" OF THE DRAFTING EFFORT BY LATE THIS WEEK OR EARLY IN THE FOLLOWING ONE. HE REMINDED THAT THE U.S. HAD ALREADY OFFERED COMMENTS ON THE EARLIER VERSION OF THE FRENCH TEXT AND SAID WE EXPECTED TO MAKE FURTHER SUGGESTIONS DURING THE AMENDING PROCESS. ALSO ON THE AGENDA FOR DECISION NOVEMBER 28 ARE PROCEDURAL MATTERS OF HOW TO COMPLETE THE DRAFT AND AT WHAT LEVEL IT MUST BE SIGNED. END SUMMARY.

1. LUNS OPENED DEBATE ON ATLANTIC RELATIONS IN THE COUNCIL BY STATING HIS HOPE THAT THE NAC WOULD COME NEAR COMPLETING ITS "PHILOSOPHICAL" DELIBERATIONS ON THE FRENCH DRAFT REVISION WITH TODAY'S DISCUSSION. THE ALLIES MIGHT THEN COME TO A CLEAR UNDERSTANDING, BY NEXT WEDNESDAY AT THE LATEST, BOTH ON SUBSTANTIVE ELEMENTS OF THE FRENCH DRAFT AND ON HOW TO PROCEED IN DEVELOPING A FINAL TEXT. THE ALLIANCE WAS WAITING "WITH PARTICULAR INTEREST" U.S. REACTIONS TO SPECIFIC ELEMENTS IN THE FRENCH DRAFT. LUNS HOPED THAT SUFFICIENT DRAFTING PROGRESS WOULD BE MADE TO PERMIT THE MINISTERS IN DECEMBER TO BLESS A FINAL DECLARATION OF THE FIFTEEN. MINISTERS WOULD ALSO BE ASKED TO DECIDE WHO WOULD ULTIMATELY SIGN THE DOCUMENT, I.E. CHIEFS OF STATE, FOREIGN MINISTERS.

2. CANADIAN PERMREP (MENZIES), SPEAKING FROM INSTRUCTIONS, NOTED THAT OTTAWA HAD APPRECIATED THE FIRST VERSION OF THE FRENCH TEXT AND APPLAUDED THE EXPANDED ATTENTION PAID TO NON-DEFENSE ITEMS IN THEIR NOVEMBER 12 REVISION. SIMILARLY, OTTAWA HAD ORIGINALLY WELCOMED THE KISSINGER INITIATIVE TO RE-THINK THE FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES OF THE ALLIANCE. MENZIES SAID THAT CANADA APPRECIATED THE STRATEGIC THESIS AND THE LOGIC IN THE FRENCH DRAFT AND WAS PREPARED TO ACCEPT THE LATTER AS THE BASIC DOCUMENT FOR FURTHER DRAFTING. MENZIES SAID THAT THE KEY NEW INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENTS WHICH THE DRAFT ADDRESSED WERE, FIRST, THE DECLARED GOAL OF THE EUROPEAN GOVERNMENTS TO UNITE, AND THE IMPACT THIS DEVELOPMENT MIGHT HAVE ON THEIR JOINT ACTION ON POLITICAL AND DEFENSE MATTERS. A SECOND KEY ELEMENT WAS THE EXISTENCE OF A ROUGH NUCLEAR PARITY BETWEEN

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 NATO 05624 01 OF 03 212052Z

THE U.S. AND THE SOVIET UNION. MENZIES SAID THAT CANADA'S REMAINING CONCEPTUAL PROBLEMS WITH THE FRENCH DRAFT CONCERNED ITS POSSIBLE REPRESENTATION OF THE ALLIANCE AS A BI-POLAR INSTITUTION DRAWING DISTINCTIONS BETWEEN NORTH AMERICA AND EUROPE. HE FELT THAT THE DOCUMENT SHOULD EXPRESS MORE PROMINENTLY THAT THE ALLIANCE CONTINUES TO BE MADE UP OF ALL 15 OF ITS MEMBERS, AND THAT THEY ALL WOULD DEMONSTRATE SUFFICIENT FLEXIBILITY TO ACCOMMODATE THE ALLIANCE TO CHANGE. MENZIES REPEATED HIS EARLIER OBJECTIONS THAT PARAGRAPHS 3, 4 AND 5 OF THE FRENCH DRAFT MIGHT CAST PUBLIC DOUBT ON THE NEED FOR THE CONTINUING PRESENCE OF CANADIAN GROUND FORCES IN GERMANY. IN PARTICULAR, HE FELT THE THRUST OF PARAGRAPHS 3 THROUGH 5 APPEARED TO BE AIMED ONLY AT DRAWING FROM THE U.S. A CONTINUING COMMITMENT OF ITS NUCLEAR

FORCES TO THE DEFENSE OF THE ALLIANCE. MENZIES SUGGESTED TOO THAT PARAGRAPHS 3 THROUGH 5 OVERSTATED THE "NAKEDNESS" OF EUROPE VIS-A-VIS THE SOVIET THREAT AND THEREFORE RISKED CALLING INTO QUESTION THE EFFECTIVENESS OF A NUCLEAR DETERRENT. HE SUGGESTED THAT PARAGRAPH 8 BE SPECIFICALLY AMENDED TO REFLECT THE REQUIREMENT FOR CANADIAN AS WELL AS AMERICAN FORCES IN EUROPEAN DEFENSE. HE SAID HIS GOVERNMENT WOULD SUBMIT BOTH BOTH SPECIFIC CHANGES TO THIS PARAGRAPH AS WELL AS OTHER MINOR AMENDMENTS.

3. ITALY (CATALANO) SAID HE HAD BEEN INSTRUCTED TO NOTE HIS AUTHORITIES' POSITIVE ASSESSMENT OF THE REVISED FRENCH DRAFT AND THEIR HOPE THAT THE DRAFTING EFFORT WOULD MOVE AHEAD RAPIDLY. HE NOTED ROME'S CONTINUING CONCERN ABOUT PARAGRAPH 4'S COVERAGE OF "U.S. NUCLEAR FORCES, WHETHER THEY ARE BASED IN THE U.S. OR IN EUROPE." HE SUGGESTED THAT THIS LAST PHRASE IN PARAGRAPH 4 BE DELETED FROM THE FINAL TEXT. CATALANO SAID ITALY HOPES THAT A FINAL TEXT WOULD BE READY BY THE END OF THE MINISTERIAL MEETING.

4. NORWEGIAN PERMREP (BUSCH) SAID HIS AUTHORITIES BELIEVED THE CURRENT REVISION WAS A GREAT IMPROVEMENT OF THE PREVIOUS DRAFT. OSLO WOULD MAKE DETAILED SUGGESTIONS FOR CHANGES ON A FEW POINTS. HIS AUTHORITIES WERE PARTICULARLY CONCERNED WITH THE POSSIBLE IMPRESSIONS CREATED BY PARAGRAPH 4 TO THE EFFECT THAT THERE IS NO ALTERNATIVE AT PRESENT TO SECURITY PROVIDED BY THE US NUCLEAR FORCES. THE IMPLICIT SUGGESTION THAT SUCH AN ALTERNATIVE MIGHT SUBSEQUENTLY EXIST, COULD SUGGEST TO THE PUBLIC THAT THERE IS A TIME LIMIT ON THE COMMITMENT OF THOSE

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 04 NATO 05624 01 OF 03 212052Z

FORCES. NORWAY SAW NO ALTERNATIVE EITHER "PRESENTLY" OR IN THE FUTURE TO THE COMMITMENT OF U.S. NUCLEAR FORCES TO EUROPEAN DEFENSE.

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 NATO 05624 02 OF 03 212120Z

73  
ACTION EUR-25

INFO OCT-01 EA-11 IO-14 ISO-00 CIAE-00 PM-07 INR-10 L-03

NEA-10 NSAE-00 PA-04 RSC-01 PRS-01 SPC-03 TRSE-00

SAJ-01 ACDA-19 SS-20 NSC-10 OMB-01 OIC-04 AEC-11

SSO-00 NSCE-00 USIE-00 INRE-00 EURE-00 AECE-00 DRC-01

/157 W

----- 054976

O P 211900Z NOV 73  
FM USMISSION NATO  
TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 2800  
SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE  
INFO ALL NATO CAPITALS PRIORITY 3466  
AMEMBASSY VIENNA PRIORITY  
USMISSION EC BRUSSELS PRIORITY  
USMISSION GENEVA PRIORITY  
AMEMBASSY TOKYO PRIORITY

CONFIDENTIAL SECTION SECTION 2 OF 3 USNATO 5624

5. NOGUEIRA (PORTUGAL) SECONDED NORWAY'S CONCERN ABOUT POSSIBLE PSYCHOLOGICAL "TIME LIMITS" CREATED BY LANGUAGE ON THE U.S. NUCLEAR COMMITMENT.

6. DENMARK (SVART), SPEAKING ON INSTRUCTIONS, SAID HIS GOVERNMENT BELIEVED THE FRENCH REVISED TEXT REPRESENTED ESSENTIAL PROGRESS TOWARD ACHIEVING A DOCUMENT ACCEPTABLE TO THE FIFTEEN. HE SAID THAT HIS GOVERNMENT WAS PREPARED TO ACCEPT PARAGRAPH 9 BUT ON THE BASIS THAT IT ONLY CONSTITUTED A REMINDER TO MEMBER COUNTRIES TO MEET THEIR DEFENSE RESPONSIBILITIES AND THAT NO NEW OBLIGATIONS IN THIS AREA WERE INVOLVED. SVART THOUGHT THE ALLIANCE'S DETENTE FUNCTION WAS STILL TOO MODESTLY STATED IN THE FRENCH TEXT. COPENHAGEN MAY THEREFORE WISH TO SUGGEST AMENDMENTS TO PARAGRAPH 11'S TREATMENT OF ALLIANCE "OBLIGATIONS" TOWARD THOSE WHO HAVE NOT YET BENEFITTED FROM ALL THE ADVANTAGES WHICH COME FROM TECHNICAL AND ECONOMIC

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 NATO 05624 02 OF 03 212120Z

PROGRESS. SVART SAID HIS AUTHORITIES UNDERSTOOD THE MAIN THESIS OF THE FRENCH DRAFT, VIZ. TO SET THE CONDITIONS FOR CONTINUING U.S. SUPPORT FOR THE ALLIANCE. THE DANES THOUGHT, HOWEVER, THAT THE DOCUMENT SHOULD GO BEYOND THIS CONCEPT TO SUGGEST MORE FORCEFULLY THAT THE ALLIANCE'S COHESION AND COMMON PURPOSE PERMIT GREAT EFFORTS TOWARD DETENTE. HIS AUTHORITIES, THEREFORE, THOUGHT THAT PARAGRAPH 2 SHOULD BE STRENGTHENED BY ADDING A REFERENCE TO THE DOUBLE PURPOSE -- DEFENSE AND DETENTE -- WHICH WERE SET AS ALLIANCE GOALS IN THE HARMEL REPORT. SVART SAID THAT THE REFERENCE IN PARAGRAPH 10 TO ALLIED CONSULTATIONS ON STEPS IN EAST-WEST DETENTE APPEARED WEAK WHEN COMPARED WITH PARAGRAPH 7 OF THE HARMEL REPORT. DENMARK WOULD SUPPORT THE BRITISH REQUEST FOR CLARIFICATIONS IN PARAGRAPH 9 SUGGESTING THAT "EAST-WEST" NEGOTIATIONS WERE INVOLVED. DENMARK WOULD ALSO SUPPORT THE NETHERLANDS' PROPOSAL FOR A PARAGRAPH 13 CALLING FOR CONTINUING REVIEW OF NATO GOALS AND STRATEGY. FURTHER ON PARAGRAPH 11, SVART SAID THE DANES PREFERRED A DESCRIPTION OF THE "CONCEPTS OF DEMOCRACY" THAT WOULD REPRESENT THESE PRINCIPLES NOT AS AN ACHIEVEMENT ALREADY ATTAINED BUT AS A GOAL TOWARD WHICH ALL OF THE ALLIANCE CONTINUES TO MOVE.

7. DE STAERCKE (BELGIUM) SUGGESTED THAT ALL AMENDMENTS BE

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

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 NATO 05624 02 OF 03 212120Z

8. ERALP (TURKEY) EXPRESSED ANKARA'S GRATITUDE FOR THE FRENCH TEXT WHICH HE SUGGESTED WAS NOW THE COUNCIL'S WORKING PAPER FOR FURTHER ELABORATION. ERALP EXPRESSED CONTINUING TURKISH CONCERNS THAT PARAGRAPH 2 PAINTED TOO OPTIMISTIC AND TOO PREMATURE A PICTURE ABOUT THE RESULTS OF THE CSCE AND DETENTE IN GENERAL. RE PARAGRAPH 8, ERALP FEARED THAT THE LANGUAGE MIGHT BE TAKEN TO REPRESENT EUROPE'S INTEREST IN DEFENDING ONLY ITSELF ONCE THE UNIFICATION PROCESS HAD DEVELOPED SUFFICIENTLY TO PERMIT IT A GREATER DEFENSE ROLE. HE BELIEVED THAT THIS IMPRESSION COULD BE CORRECTED BY CHANGING THE LAST CLAUSE IN SENTENCE 2 OF PARAGRAPH 8 TO READ "MAKE TO THE INDIVISIBLE DEFENSE OF THE ALLIANCE." ON PARAGRAPH 9, ERALP WORNDERED IF THE LANGUAGE SHOULD NOT REFLECT CONTRIBUTIONS MORE ACCORDING TO THEIR MEANS THAN TO EACH MEMBER COUNTRY'S "PLACE IN THE ALLIANCE."

9. PECK (UK) SAID THAT, AS REQUESTED, THE BRITISH HAD PREPARED A NEW ENGLISH TEXT OF THE FRENCH REVISED DRAFT. HE TERMED IT "REASONABLE STIRRING" BUT WITH EMPHASIS STILL ON ACCURACY SINCE IT IS TO SERVE AS A BASIS FOR DRAFTING. HE SAID THE BRITISH VERSION WOULD BE GIVEN TO THE IS FOR CIRCULATION.

10. FRG (KRAPF), ON INSTRUCTIONS, SAID HIS GOVERNMENT WISHED TO AMEND PARAGRAPH 8 TO MORE ADEQUATELY EXPRESS THE SUCCESSES OF THE EURO-GROUP AND SUGGESTED THAT HIS DELEGATION WOULD CIRCULATE APPROPRIATE LANGUAGE. SIMILARLY, THE FRG WOULD SEEK STRENGTHENING OF THE LANGUAGE IN PARAGRAPH 10 CALLING FOR AN ALLIED COMMITMENT TO CONSULT EACH OTHER WHENEVER A CONFLICT OUTSIDE THE TREATY AREA COULD ENDANGER ALLIANCE SECURITY.

11. NETHERLANDS (BUWALDA) REFERRED TO THE NETHERLANDS DRAFT AMENDMENTS CIRCULATED ON NOVEMBER 20 (USNATO 5582). HE AGREED

WITH OTHERS WHO FELT THAT PARAGRPAHS 3 THROUGH 5 NEEDED FURTHER STUDY AND SUGGESTED THAT PARAGRPAH 6 SHOULD ALSO BE STUDIED FURTHER SINCE IT GOES TO THE HEART OF ALLIANCE STRATEGY.

12. LUXEMBOURG (FISCHBACH) SAID HIS GOVERNMENT HAD AGREED WITH THE VIEWS EXPRESSED IN THE FIRST FRENCH DRAFT AND WERE PREPARED NOW ALSO TO ADOPT THE REVISED TEXT AS THE BASIC DRAFTING DOCUMENT. LUXEMBOURG BELIEVED THAT THE NEW VIESION HAD INCLUDED NECESSARY PRINCIPLES AND THAT THE TEXT WAS NOW EVEN MORE COMPLETE AND COHERENT. HE RESERVED THE RIGHT, HOWEVER, TO SUGGEST POSSIBLE

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 04 NATO 05624 02 OF 03 212120Z

AMENDMENTS AT THE NEXT COUNCIL DISCUSSION. HE SAID, FOR EXAMPLE, THAT LUXEMBOURG WOULD PREFER TO DELETE THE LAST CLAUSE FROM PARAGRPAH 4. RE PARAGRAPH 3, FISCHBACK SUGGESTED THAT LANGUAGE BE ADDED TO REFLECT THAT THE "INCREASINGLY SPECIFIC CHARACTER" OF EUROPEAN DEFENSE MUST ALWAYS BE SET "WITHIN THE FRAMEWORK OF NATO." FISCHBACH ATTACHED GREAT IMPORTANCE TO HAVING U.S. VIEWS ON THE DRAFT.

13. KRAPF (FRG) ASKED IF THE DUTCH CONTINUED TO WANT THE INSERTION OF AN ADDITIONAL PARAGRAPH (NUMBER 13) TO COVER CONTINUING REVIEW WITHIN THE ALLIANCE. HE TH

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 NATO 05624 03 OF 03 212129Z

73  
ACTION EUR-25

INFO OCT-01 EA-11 IO-14 ISO-00 CIAE-00 PM-07 INR-10 L-03

NEA-10 NSAE-00 PA-04 RSC-01 PRS-01 SPC-03 TRSE-00

SAJ-01 ACDA-19 SS-20 NSC-10 OMB-01 OIC-04 AEC-11

SSO-00 NSCE-00 USIE-00 INRE-00 EURE-00 AECE-00 DRC-01

/157 W  
----- 055058

O P 211900Z NOV 73  
FM USMISSION NATO  
TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 2801  
SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE  
INFO ALL NATO CAPITALS PRIORITY 3467  
AMEMBASSY VIENNA PRIORITY  
USMISSION EC BRUSSELS PRIORITY  
USMISSION GENEVA PRIORITY  
AMEMBASSY TOKYO PRIORITY

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 3 OF 3 USNATO 5624

14. BUWALDA (NETHERLANDS) SAID THAT THE HAGUE HAD NOT WITHDRAWN ITS SUGGESTION FOR A PARAGRAPH 13. NOGUEIRA (PORTUGAL) ADDED THAT HIS OWN GOVERNMENT WOULD HAVE SPECIFIC COMMENTS ON THIS DUTCH PROPOSAL BUT THAT HE WOULD RESERVE THEM FOR THE NEXT ROUND OF DISCUSSION.

15. AMBASSADOR RUMSFELD THANKED THE OTHER PERMREPS FOR THEIR INSTRUCTED CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE COUNCIL'S DEBATE. HE HOPED THAT PROPOSED AMENDMENTS WOULD BE CIRCULATED SOON, TOGETHER WITH THE UK ENGLISH TEXTUAL TRANSLATION FOR WHICH HE EXPRESSED U.S. APPRECIATION. RUMSFELD HOPED THAT HE WOULD BE IN A POSITION LATE THIS WEEK OR EARLY IN THE FOLLOWING ONE TO MAKE INSTRUCTED COMMENTS ON "THIS PHASE" OF THE DRAFT EXERCISE. HE NOTED THAT THE UNITED STATES HAD ALREADY COMMENTED ON THE EARLIER VERSION OF THE FRENCH DRAFT AND ADDED THAT WE EXPEDITED TO HAVE MORE ON THE CURRENT VERSION.

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 NATO 05624 03 OF 03 212129Z

16. DE ROSE (FRANCE THANKED HIS COLLEAGUES AND THEIR GOVERNMENTS FOR THEIR "EULOGIES," THEIR SUGGESTIONS AND CRITICISMS. HE THOUGHT THEY WOULD PERMIT THE ALLIANCE TO DRAFT A DOCUMENT SATISFACTORY TO ALL 15 CAPITALS. HE THANKED MENZIES FOR CANADA'S ACCEPTANCE OF THE FRENCH TEXT AS A BASIS FOR FURTHER DRAFTING, AND SAID THAT HE TOO MIGHT HAVE PREFERRED ADOPTION OF THE CANADIAN TEXT AS A WORKING DOCUMENT SINCE THIS WOULD HAVE SAVED HIM CONSIDERABLE EFFORT. DE ROSE OBSERVED THAT THE COUNCIL WAS "WEIGHTED DOWN" BY RECENT PRESS COVERAGE OF THE DECLARATION AND THAT THIS REQUIRED THE ALLIANCE NOW TO WORK OUT A DOCUMENT WHICH WILL HAVE "QUITE A FUTURE." HE REPEATED THAT THE TEXT SHOULD BE A PRODUCT OF THE FIFTEEN. WITH REGARD TO OTHERS' SPECIFIC COMMENTS, DE ROSE NOTED THAT SOME ARE SIMILAR TO WHAT THE FRENCH HAD WANTED TO SAY BUT HAD EXPRESSED BADLY. HE PLACED THE LANGUAGE IN PARAGRAPH 4 WHICH HAD CAUSED SOME AMBIGUITIES ABOUT U.S. NUCLEAR FORCES STATIONED IN EUROPE AND THE U.S. IN THIS CATEGORY. HE SAID THE FRENCH HAD NO INTENTION OF DESCRIBING THE U.S. NUCLEAR FORCES IN THE UNITED STATES AS OTHER THAN COMMITTED TO THE DEFENSE OF NATO. A SECOND CATEGORY OF AMENDMENTS REPRESENTED POSSIBLE DIVERGENCES IN VIEW AND THESE SHOULD BE THE SUBJECT OF FURTHER SERIOUS DISCUSSION. THE THIRD CATEGORY CONCERNED THE KEY ELEMENTS OF THE DECLARATION AS SET FORTH IN PARAGRAPHS 3, 4, 5 AND 6. DE ROSE TERMS THESE PARAGRAPHS AS "THE VERY CRUX OF WHAT WE THINK IS NECESSARY" TO SAY IN REPLY TO KISSINGER'S APRIL 23 INVITATION. HE SAID THE FRENCH HAD ATTEMPTED IN THE DRAFT TO STATE THE PROBLEM AND TO SAY SOMETHING ABOUT A PERMANENT SOLUTION TO IT, BUT WHAT THEY HAD ACHIEVED WAS NOT PERFECT. HE BELIEVED THAT, AS OTHERS HAD SUGGESTED, THIS LANGUAGE MUST BE STUDIED FURTHER. DE ROSE REMINDED THAT MANY OF THE SUGGESTIONS IN THE FRENCH DRAFT TEXT HAD COME FROM THE SUGGESTIONS SUBMITTED PREVIOUSLY BY THE OTHER ALLIES, AND THEY SHOULD CONTINUE TO SEEK TO FIND COMMON IDEAS ON THESE POINTS.

17. SECRETARY GENERAL LUNS CLOSED DISCUSSION BY SUGGESTING THAT AN ATTEMPT BE MADE TO FINALIZE COMMENTS ON THE FRENCH DRAFT BY NOVEMBER 28. HE EMPHASIZED HIS OWN HOPE THAT OF OTHERS THAT INSTRUCTED U.S. COMMENTS WOULD BE AVAILABLE BY NEXT WEDNESDAY. HE SUGGESTED THAT THE COUNCIL ALSO BE PREPARED TO DECIDE THEN ABOUT PROCEDURAL STEPS INCLUDING FINAL ADOPTION

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 NATO 05624 03 OF 03 212129Z

OF TEXT AT THE MINISTERIAL.

18. COMMENT: COUNCIL DEBATE ON ATLANTIC RELATIONS, REFLECTS A CONCERTED AND DEFINITE WILLINGNESS TO MOVE FORWARD IN THE ALLIANCE'S EFFORT TO DRAFT A DECLARATION OF THE FIFTEEN. IT IS ESSENTIAL, THEREFORE, THAT MISSION BE PROVIDED WITH INSTRUCTIONS REFLECTING OBSERVATIONS AND/OR TEXTUAL REVISIONS WHICH WASHINGTON WOULD LIKE TO SEE REFLECTED IN THE REVISED FRENCH DRAFT. WOULD WE NOT BE IN A POSITION TO MEET THIS UNDERSTANDABLE INTEREST IN OUR VIEWS ON THE PART OF OUR ALLIES, THE UNITED STATES RISKS A LOSS OF MOMENTUM IN THE CURRENT EXERCISE AS WELL AS GROWING ALLIED CONFUSION ABOUT OUR INTENTIONS. IN ORDER TO HAVE THE KIND OF DISCUSSION THAT COUNCIL HOPES TO HAVE ON THIS MATTER ON NOVEMBER 28, WE WILL NEED INSTRUCTIONS WELL IN ADVANCE OF THAT DATE. RUMSFELD

CONFIDENTIAL

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

## Message Attributes

**Automatic Decaptoning:** X  
**Capture Date:** 02 APR 1999  
**Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Current Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  
**Concepts:** n/a  
**Control Number:** n/a  
**Copy:** SINGLE  
**Draft Date:** 21 NOV 1973  
**Decaption Date:** 01 JAN 1960  
**Decaption Note:**  
**Disposition Action:** RELEASED  
**Disposition Approved on Date:**  
**Disposition Authority:** boyleja  
**Disposition Case Number:** n/a  
**Disposition Comment:** 25 YEAR REVIEW  
**Disposition Date:** 28 MAY 2004  
**Disposition Event:**  
**Disposition History:** n/a  
**Disposition Reason:**  
**Disposition Remarks:**  
**Document Number:** 1973NATO05624  
**Document Source:** ADS  
**Document Unique ID:** 00  
**Drafter:** n/a  
**Enclosure:** n/a  
**Executive Order:** 11652 GDS, 12-31-79  
**Errors:** n/a  
**Film Number:** n/a  
**From:** NATO  
**Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Image Path:**  
**ISecure:** 1  
**Legacy Key:** link1973/newtext/t19731165/abqcedkw.tel  
**Line Count:** 406  
**Locator:** TEXT ON-LINE  
**Office:** n/a  
**Original Classification:** CONFIDENTIAL  
**Original Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Original Previous Classification:** n/a  
**Original Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Page Count:** 8  
**Previous Channel Indicators:**  
**Previous Classification:** CONFIDENTIAL  
**Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Reference:** n/a  
**Review Action:** RELEASED, APPROVED  
**Review Authority:** boyleja  
**Review Comment:** n/a  
**Review Content Flags:**  
**Review Date:** 22 AUG 2001  
**Review Event:**  
**Review Exemptions:** n/a  
**Review History:** RELEASED <22-Aug-2001 by boyleja>; APPROVED <03-Oct-2001 by boyleja>  
**Review Markings:**

Declassified/Released  
US Department of State  
EO Systematic Review  
30 JUN 2005

**Review Media Identifier:**  
**Review Referrals:** n/a  
**Review Release Date:** n/a  
**Review Release Event:** n/a  
**Review Transfer Date:**  
**Review Withdrawn Fields:** n/a  
**Secure:** OPEN  
**Status:** NATIVE  
**Subject:** ATLANTIC RELATIONS: NAC DISCUSSION NOVEMBER 21  
**TAGS:** PFOR, NATO  
**To:** STATE  
SECDEF INFO ALL NATO CAPITALS  
VIENNA  
EC BRUSSELS  
GENEVA  
TOKYO  
**Type:** TE

**Markings:** Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005